

From: [steven.pedigo](#)
To: [Dana Tullis/DC/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Sam Coleman/R6/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Craig Carroll/R6/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [LisaP Jackson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Jane Lubchenco NOAA Administrator](#); [Charlie Henry NOAA](#); [Ed Levine NOAA](#); [Dr Overton LSU](#); [Nancy Jones/R6/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [oseicorp](#)
Subject: RE: Reply to your EPA Inquiry
Date: 03/28/2011 12:12 AM
Attachments: [OSEI response to Dana Tullis EPA letter of 3 25 2011.pdf](#)
[Vettingof OSE II for the BP Deep Horizon Spill of 201 emails scrubbed.pdf](#)
[Cease and desist email to Sam Coleman.pdf](#)
[RRT timeline summary 2](#)
[Coast Guard BP spill approval 1.doc](#)
[EPA Coast Guard Kangaroo court letter Signed July 12 Bioremediation letter-4.pdf](#)
[EPA Coast Guard bioremediation counter letter of 8 7 10 counter .doc](#)
[OSEI summary of BP Testing of OSE II for the Deep Horizon Macondo spill in the Gulf of New 20102011\[1\].docx](#)
[EPA Dana Tullis response letter attachment 3 28 2011.doc](#)
[Appendix C Corexit still being applied.docx](#)
[Vettingof OSE II for the BP Deep Horizon Spill of 201 emails scrubbed.pdf](#)
[EPA Coast Guard Kangaroo court letter Signed July 12 Bioremediation letter-4.pdf](#)
[EPA Coast Guard bioremediation counter letter of 8 7 10 counter .doc](#)
[OSEI summary of BP Testing of OSE II for the Deep Horizon Macondo spill in the Gulf of New 20102011\[1\].docx](#)

Dear Dana Tullis,

My response to your letter is attached along with other pertinent documents.

Sincerely,

Steven Pedigo

> From: Tullis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: Reply to your EPA Inquiry
> To: stevenosei@msn.com
> Date: Thu, 24 Mar 2011 08:23:10 -0400
>
>
> Dear Mr. Pedigo;
>
> Thank you for your February 2, 2011 e-mail to Environmental
> Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Lisa Jackson and others about the
> use of your bioremediation product Oil Spill Eater II (OSE II) in the
> Gulf of Mexico. You also raised numerous concerns regarding
> mischaracterization of OSE II for oil spill remediation. I am pleased
> to respond on behalf of the Administrator.
>
> As you know, dispersants are one option available to emergency
> responders. Use of any one option involves environmental tradeoffs and
> responders carefully consider whether skimming, booming, in situ
> burning, chemical countermeasures (such as chemical dispersants or
> bioremediation agents), or some combination of all of these may be
> necessary and appropriate to protect sensitive shorelines, water
> resources, or wildlife. Due to the large scale of the BP oil spill,
> varying weather and sea conditions, and type of discharge, responders
> used all of these techniques to minimize the impact of the spill on
> humans and the environment.
>
>
> Chemical dispersants, along with mixing energy, break up oil
> slicks into tiny particles that move into the water column so they may
> be more readily degraded by existing microorganisms in the water. The
> oil reportedly found in sediment layers you mentioned is not likely oil
> that was chemically dispersed because the tiny oil-dispersant mixture
> droplets are neutrally buoyant and neither sink nor rise but spread out
> in all directions according to underwater currents. Nonetheless, the
> presence of oil in the sediment is a concern, and we agree more



9550927

> information is needed about the long term environmental consequences
> associated with oil discharges, the use of dispersants and oil in
> sediments. EPA is already working on the regulatory requirements
> associated with the authorization and use of dispersants and initiating
> research into the fate of the oil and dispersants in the environment.
> Note that of the thousands of air, water and sediment samples collected
> and analyzed, none showed any increased level of concern for either
> dispersants or oil for aquatic life or human exposure. For more
> information about this data, see: <http://www.epa.gov/bpspill/>.
>
> EPA believes dispersants should only be used sparingly and when
> absolutely necessary. Since the well was capped, only 200 gallons of
> dispersant have been applied to the Gulf, but constant monitoring
> continues.
>
> Under the National Contingency Plan (NCP), an On-Scene Coordinator
> (OSC) carries the responsibility for directing the response to an oil
> spill. The OSC consults with the Regional Response Team (RRT), which
> consists of representatives from the state, the EPA region and, in the
> marine environment, the U.S. Coast Guard, who provides the appropriate
> regional mechanism for development and coordination of assistance and
> advice to the OSC during response actions. RRTs conduct advance
> planning for the use of dispersants, surface washing and collecting
> agents, burning agents, bioremediation agents, or other chemical agents
> in accordance with the regulations under Subpart J of the NCP. Although
> a product is listed on the NCP Product Schedule, such a product cannot
> be applied without an OSC's authorization.
>
>
> With respect to bioremediation agents like OSE II, EPA in
> conjunction with the US Coast Guard, collaborated with scientists from
> the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the
> Deepwater Horizon Science and Engineering Review Team (H-SERT) which
> consists of scientists from Louisiana State University, University of
> Louisiana at Lafayette, University of New Orleans, Tulane University,
> and Southern University on the use of innovative technologies to
> remediate the Gulf of Mexico region. This team reached consensus that
> bioremediation would provide limited value for oil discharges in
> general. There may be specific situations where bioremediation might be
> considered after a thorough evaluation of the site-specific conditions
> (including oil composition and concentrations and an assessment of
> nutrient and oxygen limitations) and limited testing to ensure the
> benefits outweigh any risks before a decision to implement such a course
> of action is made. The details on this finding are contained in a
> letter to Governor Bobby Jindal which can be found at:
> <http://www.epa.gov/bpspill/bioremediation-letter-20100712.pdf>.
>
> We appreciate your interest in restoration of the Gulf and that
> OSE II can help in that effort. The Gulf Restoration Task Force will
> determine the appropriate strategies used for restoring the Gulf of
> Mexico. If chemical or bioremediation agents are needed for specific
> restoration areas, the Task Force will rely on the Product Schedule for
> insights.
>
> Thank you again for your email. As stated in our previous
> response to you in December 2010, the Office of Emergency Management
> (OEM) is interested in meeting with you to discuss the results of
> demonstrations and uses of OSE II and to discuss the Agency's effort to
> revise the requirements under Subpart J of the National Contingency
> Plan. Please contact Craig Matthiessen of my Office, at 202-564-8016,

> to discuss a meeting and to address any additional questions you may
> have.
>
> Sincerely,
> Dana S. Tulis
> Acting Director
> Office of Emergency Management
>
> cc: Sam Coleman – EPA Region 6
> Craig Matthiessen – Office of Emergency Management

TARGET SHEET

SITE NAME: DEEPWATER HORIZON

CERCLIS I.D.: DWHLAXN10036

TITLE OF DOC.: RRT TIMELINE SUMMARY 2

DATE OF DOC.: 10/01/2011

NO. OF PGS. THIS TARGET SHEET REPLACES: UNKNOWN

SDMS #: 9551148 **RELATED #:** 9550927

CONFIDENTIAL ? ☐ **MISSING PAGES ?** ☒

ALTERN. MEDIA ? ☐ **CROSS REFERENCE ?** ☐

LAB DOCUMENT ? ☐ **LAB NAME:**

ASC./BOX #:

CASE #: **SDG #:**

COMMENTS : THIS IS AN UNKNOWN OR UNSUPPORTED FORMAT
AND CANNOT BE OPENED AT THIS TIME.